DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 483 VT 015 461

TITLE	AIAA Employment Workshops (September 1, 1970-December 31, 1971). Volume 1, Final Report.
INSTITUTION	American Inst. of Aeronautics and Astronautics, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	DOL-MP-82-36-71-01
PUB DATE	31 Dec 71
NOTE	50p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Aerospace Industry; Demonstration Programs; *Employment Services; Engineers; Job Placement; *Professional Personnel; Scientific Personnel; Scientists; *Unemployment; Vocational Counseling; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics

ABSTRACT

In response to growing unemployment among professional personnel in the aerospace industry, a series of 175 workshops were conducted by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA) in 43 cities. Nearly 15,000 unemployed engineers and scientists attended the workshops and reviewed job counseling and placement services from volunteer groups working to match skills and jobs. A followup survey of participants revealed that 42 percent obtained jobs within 6 months, and 98 percent would recommend the workshop to others. The workshops filled a need for reliable, inexpensive, and readily accessible job counseling services. The workshops' success in spreading across the country was attributed to the efforts of AIAA professional staff and the ability to attract local support because of publicity and the relatively low cost of the workshops compared with the benefits received. Volumes II and III are available as VT 015 462 - 015 463 in this issue. (BH)

ED 063483

VT
F-LHE

AIAA
EMPLOYMENT WORKSHOPS

September 1, 1970—December 31, 1971

VOLUME I

FINAL REPORT

VT015461

This report of a demonstration project was prepared under a contract with the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Organizations undertaking such projects under the government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AIAA EMPLOYMENT WORKSHOPS

September 1, 1970 - December 31, 1971

VOLUME I

FINAL REPORT

A Demonstration Manpower Project

Undertaken by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics in 43 cities in 25 States of the United States
and
Funded by the U.S. Department of Labor
Manpower Administration Contract #82-36-71-01

This report is in three volumes of which this is the first. Volume I is a general overview of the Employment Workshops program. Volume II is an analysis of the effectiveness of the program based on survey data collected during and two and six months after the conclusion of some of the early Workshops. Volume III is a handbook telling in detail exactly how to organize and operate a Workshop.

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	1
PREFACE	3
INTRODUCTION	4
FACTUAL HIGHLIGHTS OF THE WORKSHOP PROGRAM	7
CONCLUSIONS	8
BASIC WORKSHOP PLAN	10
First Session	10
Second Session	10
Third Session	11
ORGANIZING THE WORKSHOPS	12
First Contacts	12
Materials	13
Early Publicity	13
Funding	14
Continuing Publicity	14
Workshop Administration	14
Counselor Training	14
OPERATING THE WORKSHOPS	16
Brainstorming Reviews	16
Attrition	16
Fees for Workshops	17
Continuity	17
ES Participation	18
New Counselors	18
THE WORKSHOP ATTENDEES	20
THE WORKSHOP SESSIONS	22
First Session	22
Second Session	23
Third Session	24

CONTENTS

	Page
GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	26
WORKSHOP VARIATIONS	29
AIAA ASSESSMENT	31
APPENDICES	
A. Abstract of Highlights from Volume II, an Analytic Report on Some Effects of Twenty-two Workshops	32
B. Letter from a Workshop Attendee (Dear Norm).....	35
Letter from a Workshop Attendee (Dear Wayne).....	37
C. Remarks from a Workshop Counselor	41

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Employment Workshop program was an undertaking of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. The project was funded by the Manpower Administration of the United States Department of Labor and was monitored by it at every stage. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration also contributed funds to the project.

Many individuals and organizations have contributed in varying degrees to the success of the program. Not all can be given credit here, but the voluntary assistance and participation of counselors and Workshop organizers in various cities were essential to the program, and this expression of appreciation is intended for all who were involved.

Organizations which made major contributions include:

Thursday Thirteen of Los Angeles, Inc.
Lockheed Aircraft Corporation
Northrop Institute of Technology
Southern California Technical Personnel Committee
Los Angeles Unified School District
TRW, Inc.
Forty Plus of Southern California

AIAA members who made major contributions include:

Frederick Bagby, Battelle Memorial Institute
Robert Diehl, Jet Propulsion Laboratory
Kaye Kiddoo, Lockheed Aircraft Corporation
Robert Levine, National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Charles Miesse, Roy Weston, Inc.
Frank Page, retired
Guy Righter, McDonnell Douglas Corporation
Donald Rowe, Aerojet General Corporation
Ronald Smelt, Lockheed Aircraft Corporation
John Vaughan, McDonnell Douglas Corporation

Employment Service personnel who made major contributions include:

Albert Rostein - Philadelphia
James Scanlan - Seattle
William Sullivan - Boston

Representatives of the U.S. Department of Labor who made major contributions:

Juliet Brussel
Paul Mayrand
Finlay Petrie

Consultants who made major contributions:

Lew Byrd, Bradco
Leonard Smith, Humanic Designs Corporation

AIAA staff members who made major contributions:

Norman C. Hill
Stanley Kramer
Leonard Rosenberg
Llewellyn Stanton
Donald Stone

Geoffrey A. Potter
Project Director

PREFACE

Faced with a growing roster of unemployed friends and acquaintances, members of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA) in the Los Angeles area, drawing on the aid of their professionally employed staff there and from New York, ran workshops on job hunting. They gave new direction to the disheartened in their fraternity by showing that, properly armed, they could find work again. From this beginning flowed the incentive and organization for AIAA groups to operate nationwide through the financial support of the U.S. Department of Labor.

INTRODUCTION

In the 1960s the aerospace business was booming. As the field expanded from the middle '50s, it drew more and more highly trained professionals. The engineering schools couldn't keep up with the demand. As contracts terminated, new ones replaced them, and added to them. So the professional population of the aerospace field became accustomed both to job hopping for advancement and to changes in employer, depending on the winds of contract movement. Many changed jobs as many as five times in a two-year period to advance their careers more quickly. Contract changes forced job changes; but because of the expansion of the field, most engineers and scientists could look forward to steady employment even if laid off every year or two. Often a professional left one employer on a Friday and reported to the next the following Monday. The real need to look for a job was not part of this picture.

In the late 1960s, however, budgetary cutbacks in the aerospace program began. Fewer contracts were let, some were stretched, and many were cancelled, and soon professionals outnumbered jobs. The memory of the previous ten years was not easily erased. Few unemployed professionals stirred themselves actively to look for work because they assumed that new contracts would soon be coming and they would be called. That didn't happen. Instead, more unemployed entered the job market. Unused to searching for work competitively, many otherwise able professionals found themselves frustrated if not deeply depressed. It now has become commonplace in the field to hear of the divorce of an unemployed friend, and not too rarely, of a suicide.

A number of AIAA members concluded that the Institute should do something about this increasingly desperate situation. An AIAA survey revealed 5000-6000 Southern California professionals out of work, mostly in the Greater Los Angeles area. Late in 1969, the Institute began to tackle the problem. (It should be noted that the Institute's roles stood at an all-time high in 1969 - that its members and staff were not responding to a drop in membership but a need in the field.)

AIAA leaders realized that most of these men had been recruited directly out of college, that the demand for their services over the past 20 years had been so sustained that they never had to engage in a systematic, competitive search for employment, and that consequently they faced the future bitter and disheartened. The AIAA leaders knew few professionals had built up benefits with any one employer--had little if anything in the way of pension rights, accumulated vacation, severance pay, or necessary insurance coverage. And they judged the down trend in employment would continue.

AIAA had a charter and the means to take immediate action in the interests of the unemployed: teach them how to look for work in a systematic and competitive way. After investigating a number of ideas, several AIAA staff members working with representatives of Thursday Thirteen, Forty Plus, the Southern California Technical Personnel Committee, and a number of interested AIAA Los Angeles Section members hammered out, in a concentrated effort of several weeks, the AIAA Employment Workshop program. Workshop materials were drawn from a variety of sources. An operating committee was put together in the Los Angeles Section, counselors trained, and the first Workshop publicized and launched in less than a month. Throughout this entire effort, and for many months after, very strong and consistent support was given to the entire effort by the local AIAA staff as well as the local membership.

The first AIAA Workshop was held in Los Angeles in March 1970. Even though reservations had been required, 300 more than those accepted on the basis of their reservations showed up, some from as far as 75 miles away. A great deal of publicity attended this initial effort, and CBS television covered it on a network news program.

During the spring, word of the program spread; and as inquiries from surrounding areas multiplied, new Workshops were organized in the area surrounding Los Angeles, while in Los Angeles itself the waiting list grew to as long as two months and double sessions became necessary. A story in the Institute's magazine, Astronautics & Aeronautics, gave wide publicity to the Workshop effort, and inquiries from other areas began to pour in, soon followed by requests for Workshops. It was decided, because of its proximity to national headquarters in New York, to start another program on Long Island, an area of very heavy professional unemployment.

With this start demonstrated, and seeing the unemployment situation worsening, the Institute began to try to obtain funding to carry on the program and to broaden it into other areas. Starting in May its staff approached several government agencies. By this time, another AIAA survey revealed that, during the previous 15 months, 22,000 professionals had been laid off and that in the next six months another 16,000 would be let go. This frightening statistic proved very conservative.

Armed with these figures, AIAA made a proposal to the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) during the summer of 1970; and as a consequence, on September 1, 1970, DOL granted the Institute a contract to run a series of four Workshops in each of these cities--Boston, Dallas-Fort Worth, Huntsville, Philadelphia, and Seattle--and to make a detailed analysis of the results.

Within a month of this project's start, it became obvious that the situation was worsening all over the country. DOL asked AIAA to submit a proposal for expanding the program. In October AIAA submitted its proposal, and in November DOL extended the contract to cover 29 more cities. Later modifications extended the program to cover 43 cities.

At the end of the contract, some 14,600 professionals had attended 175 Workshops in 43 cities throughout the country, and nearly 53,000 volunteer hours had been contributed to their operation.

But AIAA felt the Workshops represented only a first step; and in the spring of 1971, it again approached DOL with a proposal, this one to establish voluntary self-help groups, patterned after the Experience Unlimited program sponsored by California Department of Human Resources and Development, to be affiliated with State Employment Services. The volunteer groups would develop jobs, catalog the skills and abilities of members, match them to the job orders, and send them out to try to land the jobs. The Employment Service (ES) would house the groups, giving them office space and allowing them the use of telephones and the franking privilege. In turn, ES would have the benefit of a volunteer professional arm, specializing in technical professionals--an arm many ES offices had not had before and which others had had to either cut back or eliminate.

On June 1, 1971, DOL issued AIAA a contract for this program, called Volunteer Engineers Scientists Technicians (VEST). In October, a contract modification expanded the initial program and took over the Workshop program.

This report, in three volumes, of which this is the first, tells how the Workshops came to be and why, and offers AIAA's own evaluation and assessment of them. Volume II presents an analytic report on 22 early Workshops based on data gathered from attendees and then followed up two and six months after course completion. Volume III comprises a handbook which tells in great detail how to put together and operate a Workshop. Hopefully, it will aid anyone planning similar efforts.

In this first volume of the report, we talk about what went well and why and what problems were run into and why. Comments from attendees help illustrate why things were done and why we fell they were successful. Page 7 contains the highlights and the following section on page 8 the main conclusions.

FACTUAL HIGHLIGHTS OF THE WORKSHOP PROGRAM

* 175 Workshops were put on in 43 cities.

* 22 Workshops were put on in one city alone, Los Angeles, starting in March 1970.

* 14,600 out-of-work aerospace professionals attended the Workshops.

* 53,000 volunteer hours were put into the program.

* Within six months of the Workshop, it was estimated that 42 percent of those responding to the contract follow-up survey had obtained jobs.

* Workshop attendees rated it 8+ on a scale of 0 to 10.

* 98 percent of the attendees responding to the contract follow-up survey would recommend the Workshop to others.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions: Our experience with the Employment Workshops leads us to these conclusions:

1. Before the Workshops, unemployed aerospace professionals lacked a readily accessible, inexpensive, reliable job-counseling service. The Workshops served this purpose.

   a. The Workshops revealed the haphazard and demoralized approach of the unemployed technically trained individual to the problem of seeking employment, and confirmed the need for sympathetic counseling on professional matters.

   b. Many local Employment Services were found not only unable to cope well with the problems of the unemployed professional, but did not have the manpower or the tools with which to help them. There turned out to be a mutual value in involving ES in the program.

   c. Workshop experience helped show the indifference if not outright dislike of many potential employers for engineers and scientists from the aerospace fields. This shaped the strategy of job counseling. The same proved true of other factors affecting employment, such as age.

   d. The combination of sympathetic peers as counselors and the Institute aegis gave the Workshop program credibility to the job hunter and prospective employer alike.

   e. Bright, capable people, employed and unemployed, were able to become counselors within this kind of a Workshop with what many professionals would regard as practically no training.

   f. The initial Workshops drew more attendance than at first expected, and so evidenced the need for a wider effort.

2. The professional staff of the Institute not only catalyzed the initial Workshops but spread them across the country as fast as the Institute's leaders could approve wider action and make funds available. The Workshops could not and would not have spread quickly and effectively without the action of the Institute's professional staff. Central administration facilitated the creation and systematic use of effective Workshop settings and materials, such as a handbook on job hunting.

a. The staff knew about the rising stresses of unemployment quicker than anyone in the Institute because of frequent meetings with local Institute officers, especially in Los Angeles, where AIAA keeps a professionally staffed office.

b. The professional staff conferred with elected Institute leaders individually more often than the leaders met together, and so could judge the readiness of this leadership to back each step in setting up and extending the Workshops. The staff provided, that is, fast feedback directly to the decision-making and fund-controlling levels of the Institute.

3. The publicity given a Workshop in its locale directly affected its attendance.

a. The local AIAA organizations permitted fast contact with the unemployed by newsletter, local business meetings, and word of mouth.

b. The Institute's national character paved the way for radio, TV, and newspaper coverage. Again, the direction of the professional staff catalyzed publicity but the ES was able to provide excellent channels to sources of publicity.

4. The Workshop program attracted a steady flow of local support and participants, such as professionals as counselors, and moved from one local setting to a nationwide network because anyone involved could see right away that, for relatively little money, it helped the attendees.

a. Although the word at first was that the Institute just wanted a salve to bad conscience, word of mouth reporting and local Section meetings clearly evidenced the good effects of the program in terms of actual re-employment and member morale. The program showed that AIAA had not stood stock still in a bad time.

b. No one opposed the program, and it drew increasing support in each local setting. The section on "Assessment" in the report amplifies these conclusions. The Appendix on page 32 gives an abstract of the results of the Analytic Report. Roughly 55% of the attendees who obtained employment within two months in part attributed attendance in a Workshop to their success.

BASIC WORKSHOP PLAN

An Employment Workshop prepares professionals to be competitive in their job search and teaches them effective techniques of presenting themselves to a potential employer in an "employer's" market. It also aims to bolster morale and improve attitudes. A peer group of "counselors" runs the Workshop, through seminars and a structured lesson plan. (AIAA used the term "counselor" long before DOL entered the program; but as used by AIAA, this term must not be confused with its official ES use for their professional counselors.) A basic Workshop consists of three sessions, each 2 1/2 to 4 hours long, spaced a week apart. At each session all the participants gather in a large room for introductory remarks and announcements (not more than 20 minutes). Participants then split into small groups of four to eight, each attended by a trained counselor.

First Session

The first session sets the stage for developing a systematic job search. It serves to outline the problems of career change and job finding and to give an overview of the employment situation and the personal circumstances of the participants. Financial, personal, and professional self-analysis and skills evaluation and their importance are explained. Sources of employment information and methods of finding employment are discussed at length. The concept of the "hiring influence" is introduced, as is the process of "de-selection." Then the homework assignment for the next session is given, preparation of a new resume and a personal sales letter. Considerable discussion is then given to the preparation of resume and letter. Participants are asked to bring eight copies of each to the next session for a critique by the people in the group.

Second Session

The second session concerns personal sales materials--the letters and resumes. At both this and the third session, participants are asked to sit with a different counselor and participants, thus insuring a broader exposure to ideas and approaches. The resumes and letters are individually critiqued by the other attendees and the counselor. An effective counselor will see to it that most of the discussion is by the participants and that he acts merely as a discussion leader, insuring that the participants cover all the pertinent points. In addition, at this session preparation of personal sales material and distribution methods are discussed, plus systematizing the sales campaign. The important subject of references is also covered, and finally the homework for the third session is given: prepare for a specific interview and bring a revised letter and resume plus an interview kit.

Third Session

The third session covers interview techniques, general preparation and key questions, and salary negotiation. The importance of approaching an interview from the viewpoint of the employer's self-interest is discussed, along with a review of the various types of interview which can take place and the necessity of a maximum amount of research on a prospective employer. But the main portion of the final session treats role playing. The counselor interviews each of the participants along lines the participant himself has structured (type of organization, the type of job, and position of interviewer). The rest of the group in turn gives a critique of each interview.

Individual counseling may follow up this course.

ORGANIZING THE WORKSHOPS

(Note: The first AIAA Workshops were handled administratively by the Institute's West Coast office, and therefore were not like the ones later funded by the Department of Labor. Over the period of a year and a half, systems and techniques changed, not only administratively, but also in connection with the functioning of the Workshop itself and even the material used. At the end of the DOL contract, the basic system remains the same but refined and streamlined.)

First Contacts:

A factor basic to the whole Workshop program,its voluntary aspect, gives it many advantages but at the same time compels certain requirements. One cannot, for instance, ask volunteers too much in the way of "dog work." So a system had to be found whereby good people could be identified at the local level and then the necessary tools and systems put into their hands so that they could work easily and effectively.

Early in the program, the AIAA faced an organizing problem in areas dominated by one company, and that company making efforts to take care of its laid-off employees and feeling that a Workshop would indicate that it wasn't doing the job well enough or properly. Since the administrative people at the local level of the Workshops need to be employed so that they have the use of the mails, reproducing services and telephones, this created quite an obstacle. (Generally, AIAA made its initial contact to its local Section. The local ES was notified at that time and its participation solicited. In a few cases, it was necessary, because of high unemployment and only a small number of AIAA people on hand, to enlist the assistance of members of other societies; and these invariably cooperated and effectively aided the program.) If the employer in a single-employer town did not want the Workshop, there was little chance of getting it off the ground successfully. Then either the Workshop could be put off until the situation got worse, or it could be run on the terms that the company wanted. Where the company's terms were workable, AIAA went ahead. Where they weren't, Institute representatives approached the company management at a high level to see if the policy could be changed. Often top management was unaware of what was going on at the lower levels, and this tactic would work.

In the first few years of the rapidly declining employment, a number of companies did a good job trying to place their discharged professionals and to give them every assistance. But as the numbers increased and company resources dried up, services like the AIAA Workshops became more valuable to the employers.

So a Workshop might be instituted by the AIAA being invited into an area either by a company or by the local members. AIAA representatives also independently

assessed the need for a Workshop in many areas and then met with members to explain the Workshop program and show how it could be used.

Volume III of this report, the handbook, tells in detail the mechanics of organizing a Workshop at the local level.

Materials:

In the beginning of the program, the local committees were given camera-ready copy for the materials that would be used. Many Workshops were able to have material printed well and inexpensively but others, for a variety of reasons, did the job at a very high cost. Some were inexperienced in dealing with printers; and, though given instructions on what to do and where services could be obtained at a reasonable price, nevertheless, for one reason or another, they used a more expensive method or failed to take the advice. Of all the Workshops run, only a few proved very expensive, but it did make the controlling of costs difficult and not easily predictable.

Early Publicity:

Another area not easy to control was publicity. Initial publicity usually consisted of the mailing of a descriptive flyer on the Workshops to the membership of the local AIAA group and other local professional groups if they too were affected by unemployment. Newspaper and television publicity generally came with the start of the Workshop, rather than in advance, and helped to maintain attendance. In this area, the Employment Services were helpful with contacts, often with the media, and also through lists of their own on the unemployed registered in their offices.

Several AIAA groups arranged with local employers to enclose notices of the Workshops in the envelopes of all terminating employees. Some employers, at the time of the exit interview, suggested that an employee being let go attend the Workshops. An effort was made to extend this practice to all the Workshop areas, but not all employers were willing.

In all matters of publicity it was found that the professional public relations people from the employers were better at the job and more effective in gaining publicity than engineers or scientists. It was often difficult to persuade the local committees that the professional PR person could do the job without disturbing his regular work.

The printing problem could be solved, as it was, by doing it all from the central office, but the publicity and mailing activities had to be local to the Workshop and the financing of such efforts had to be carefully controlled.

Funding:

No one was paid for personal services or expenses. The funding for the program covered staff salaries, travel, materials, communications, and project facilities. This last was the other problem difficult to control. Early in the program there were no problems in obtaining free facilities. However, as time went on, other businesses and organizations began to feel the pinch, too, and they could no longer commit their facilities and the people required to maintain them without reimbursement for direct costs. There was little consistency in the charges around the country, and budgeting on this item was not easy.

Despite these problems, 14,600 people went through 175 Workshops in 43 cities at about $12.50 per person.

Continuing Publicity:

Good publicity, well handled, produced an excellent initial response to a Workshop program. However, keeping a flow of unemployed professionals into a series of Workshops demanded a continuing PR effort. Stories in newspapers, spot announcements on radio, and mailing of flyers to organizational members or lists of the unemployed obtained from the Employment Services proved necessary to maintain the visibility of the Workshops. Too often, as it became immersed in the actual operation of a Workshop, the local organizing committee assumed that everyone knew about it. In several areas Workshops tended to disappear from public view as soon as the publicity subsided. Personal publicity, or the recommendation of former attendees, was helpful, but usually not sufficient to generate the kind of audience judged available. Of all the committee functions, this one needed the most constant attention, and this one most often failed over the long run.

Workshop Administration:

The local committee also strongly influenced, of course, the success of a Workshop. The AIAA staff tried to identify a "driver" to head the effort and see that the others did their part. It favored an employed man because he usually had his employer's resources behind him. But the effort usually required several professionals, each with some resources, on the committee. There were exceptions; one man handled a Workshop by himself for more than a year and a half.

Counselor Training:

The local committee and the AIAA staff solicited local professionals as counselors, and, a week before the first Workshop, gave counselor training (detailed in Volume III). Naturally, the task of choosing counselors required knowledge of the local AIAA membership, and it called for some tact.

Personnel people were sometimes invited to become counselors. They usually proved skeptical about the ability of the trainees to do the job properly, and often they were antagonistic to the methods and to the principles taught. Some would disagree fundamentally with the program and never changed their minds, and some weren't sure but were willing to hear it out and to see how it worked. Most saw the rationale behind the program and accepted it and became good counselors. For many of these it was not easy to say that, when looking for a job, a man must find "the hiring influence" --the man in an organization whose word moved a job (not the personnel man). But many did, and when they told an attendee, this had considerable impact.

Some state Employment Service offices volunteered counselors. Nearly all found themselves in agreement with what was being taught.

One group was excluded: professional counselors (private employment agencies, guidance or career counselors, and the like). It was discovered early in the game that such parties might join a Workshop to look for likely clients, and so tend to direct their energies to one individual to the neglect of the others.

OPERATING THE WORKSHOPS

From the first, the actual operation of the Workshops appeared to go smoothly. The committees were earnest and committee members worked hard not only preparing for the Workshops, but also attending sessions and supervising. They regularly monitored the various counselors' activities and performance and made themselves available in emergencies whenever they arose.

Brainstorming Reviews:

In the spring of 1971 AIAA held two brainstorming sessions, one in Los Angeles and the other in Washington. These brought together Workshop chairmen and many Employment Service personnel involved, and produced a number of ideas that became part of the regular operation of the Workshops. For instance, the Wichita group held pre-session briefings and post-session debriefings for its counselors at every session. Such a pre-session briefing, a 15-20 minute review of what was to happen in that particular session, along with discussion of any questions that might be raised, became part of the final Workshop structure.

Seattle had its committee recap the comments of the attendees for each of the counselors, so that he would know how his audience rated him. Thus, it was possible to help some of the counselors and eliminate others whose performance was below the standard set. Because of the amount of work involved in such an activity, it was not possible to persuade all Workshops to do this.

Attrition:

A Workshop always suffered a certain amount of attrition right on down the line. If 125 registered with the answering service for the Workshop, between 100 and 110 would show up. There would be another drop-off of varying degree, sometimes as much as 30 percent, after the first session, and a small drop-off between the second and third sessions. It was found that the longer an attendee had to wait betwen the time of registration and his Workshop, the less likely he was to show up. A few cities with long back-up lists sent out reminder cards a week or two in advance, and this helped. Los Angeles operated concurrent double sessions.

The Workshops agreed not to make the printed material available in advance, though many attendees said they would like it. It was felt that if a potential attendee had all the written material in hand in advance, he would not come to the Workshop because he would tend to assume that he then had all that could be obtained.

We think this was a reason that attendees did not come back for the second and third sessions. They assumed that they had gotten the basic philosophy of the course the first night and all the written material.

But, of course, much of the value of the Workshop came through peer-group discussion and criticism of the printed materials, letters and resumes in the second session, and interview techniques in the third session.

Considerable effort was made to persuade attendees to come to all three sessions. They were asked to do so at the general meetings and by their counselors. Especially after the initial Workshop experience, the value of what was to be given in the second and third sessions was pointed out and explained early.

Fees for Workshops:

Many believed that the payment of a fee would help secure the success of the Workshop program--that having made an investment, a person would feel much more obliged to get the full return on it and would be inclined to attend all three sessions.

The fee arrangement was rejected. The Institute wanted to act in the interests of its unemployed members and did not want the question of a fee making is efforts look self-seeking and possibly remunerative. The voluntary aspect of the program might well have been damaged by charging a fee. But the fact that the program was free did seem to keep some people away. The better-paid professionals, especially the high-level managers, did not come to the Workshops.

Continuity:

Sequential Workshops, usually in areas with either a high level of unemployment or continuing unemployment, presented some problems.

Many of the cities operated two or three Workshops, and then needed no more. A few others operated sporadically--a couple of Workshops, four or five months without one, and then a couple of more; these were difficult to handle, and in most cases had to be completely reorganized when restarted.

For Workshops that continued steadily, in such places as Los Angeles, Seattle, and Philadelphia, it was necessary to maintain enthusiasm and a high level of energy by constantly bringing new blood into the operational side of the program. Some found it necessary to keep bringing new people in on a regular basis. A few went in for complete reorganization. Others brought people in gradually

as they phased others out. The various systems all appeared to work well, apparently reflecting the nature of the individuals involved in a particular Workshop. What was important was that the changes were planned and phased sufficiently well that there were no major disruptions in the operation of the program.

Some individuals stayed with their programs for long periods of time. Some counselors gave a night a week for over a year. One area had a small Workshop which operated on a continuing weekly basis and was in the nature of a neighborhood Workshop, everything done by one man. The man was and is dedicated and competent, and the hundreds of people who went through his Workshop were well served and trained.

In some of the Workshops, certain counselors found that they enjoyed and were particularly adept at one or another of the three sessions. They became specialists and could be depended on for their particular session.

Counselors generally stayed with a program longer than administrative people. There were two reasons for this. The administrative job took a great deal of time during the day as well as in the evenings. The counselor worked only in the evening, and his work had a direct personal reward of meeting and helping people who needed help.

ES Participation

The local Employment Service (ES) participation seemed to have some benefits. ES people brought expertise to the Workshop that was not readily available elsewhere. They had job-market information, and they were able to describe services available to the unemployed that many did not know about. Their interest, concern and ability often helped to dispel the impression that the Employment Service had little to offer an unemployed professional. Some ES personnel in turn were exposed to a new kind of audience. They seemed impressed with the people at the Workshops. Some employers who sat with ES people in Workshops established a relationship which they might not have otherwise. Also, many attendees who would not have considered going to ES for help now do.

New Counselors:

Keeping a fresh flow of counselors became a matter of high priority.

Counselors kept an eye out for attendees who appeared to be good prospects. Many Workshops asked each counselor to turn in the names of such prospects at the end of each session. Since no attendee had the same counselor twice, each attendee would be seen by at least three counselors. If an individual's name came up twice or more, he was generally asked if he would like to participate as a counselor.

The Workshop format required each attendee to sit with a different counselor and with different attendees at each session. This was done to broaden his exposure to different views, ideas, and criticisms and to help avoid the dependence that bordered on the father image that many formed for the counselors. Also, hearing the same general ideas and techniques from a variety of people helped many accept more easily what to them were new ideas.

Another system was to recruit a new team of counselors in much the same manner as the original ones had been.

In both cases, training of the new counselors was necessary. Many Workshops asked the AIAA staff to come back for regular training sessions, some on regular intervals. Many of them asked counselors who had already been to training sessions to come back again, because new techniques had been developed as the Workshop program went along.

Another way of training involved making an alumnus an assistant counselor to one of the best in the counseling group. This worked if an adept person had been through the Workshop with good counselors and then had been assistant counselor to other good ones. It did not work except in this selective manner.

THE WORKSHOP ATTENDEES

The analytic report in Volume II describes the kinds ot people who attended the Workshop.

A few other observations might be made here. A majority of the attendees was white. Some were oriental, and very few were black. Workshops, by the way, had the services of a number of black counselors. There were also some female counselors, but few female attendees.

Many attendees came to Workshops discouraged, disheartened and depressed. Many didn't recognize it, some did. Our analysis does not measure what the Workshops did for morale. Here are a few direct quotes from attendees on that subject:

-- "Keep using sensitive, skilled counselors. T...J... dealt effectively with some real problems in our session, and he was sensitive to the feelings of men who could easily feel very alone if not desperate."

-- "These sessions have stimulated self-confidence and generated thought processes, which is very helpful to do one's best (putting best foot forward) in resumes and personal interviews."

-- "The greatest thing I obtained from your sessions was the redevelopment of my self-confidence."

-- "Thanks again for the efforts in my behalf and for a renewed faith in myself. The encouragement instilled is probably half the battle."

-- "It has been very disheartening for me to be unemployed and I have been ready and able to work. Through suggestion and encouragement, the Workshops restored my self-confidence and personal vitality in approaching employment situations. It gave me an awareness of opportunities and increased my ability to take advantage of them. I now feel like a hunter with a jungle full of targets rather than a wanderer in search of the Phoenix."

As Volume II shows, the attendees were well educated. In addition to the contract survey, AIAA surveyed nearly every other attendee with a questionnaire developed before DOL began its support of the program.

One typical Workshop surveyed with that questionnaire had 85.7 % with at least a B.S. degree, of which 54.8% had a B.S. plus work toward another degree,

25.6% had a master's degree of higher, and 5.3% held a Ph.D.

The typical attendee had reached middle age. The Workshop just cited had 54.5% over 44, 44.7% being between 45 and 54. In this same group, 60.9% had been unemployed more than six months and 2.7% for more than a year. Salaries, when employed, had ranged from $6240 to $30,000 a year, with an average of $15,345. That Workshop survey was entirely representative of most.

Attendees sought information that would help them. And they came bitter. Often the first session had a lot of time devoted to the ventilation of anger, frustration, and vindictiveness toward former employers--and especially toward the government, which had called upon them when it needed them and now was discarding them when it had other priorities. Attendees said it helped to sit down with a group of six or eight other professionals and realize that they weren't alone. It was of value to them to see that another man, perhaps better educated, perhaps higher paid and perhaps even more competent, in the same difficult situation, no job, no money, no prospects, and little hope. A man often found that no matter how bad he felt his situation was, he could find somebody who was worse off. So the first session often turned attitudes around and started the motivational process needed in a successful job hunt.

In many areas of the country people have been unemployed for two to three years, and it was understandable that they had completely withdrawn not only from any active effort to find a job, but also to do anything. Many were convinced that it was hopeless and that there weren't any jobs. A real project was to channel their thinking not only into constructive channels, but also into <u>different</u> ones as well. For them the thought that they could do something different than they had been doing for a number of years was difficult to get across, but that, too, was a value of the Workshop because, working in their groups, many convinced each other not only that it could be done but how to do it.

There were many who couldn't understand the basic premises of the Workshop or who resisted them so completely that the Workshop did them no good. Some were so defeated that they were convinced nothing could help them, and you got the impression that they were attending merely to say they had tried when, in fact, they weren't trying at all.

Against an estimated pool of unemployed technical professionals numbering about 100,000, the Workshops reached only about 15%. Again, it's not possible to measure, but many active in the Workshops thought that those who needed them most failed to come for the very attitudes that a Workshop hoped to alter. Many attendees unfortunately still conducted only a half-hearted job search. Many others, not better qualified in experience, but more highly motivated, sought work assiduously, along the lines developed in Workshops, and found it.

THE WORKSHOP SESSIONS

Volume III of this report describes the sessions in detail. A synopsis appears on page 10. It rightly emphasizes the value of the peer counselor.

The counselor guides the discussion. He does not teach. He is a moderator. He knows the points that must be covered, and he tries to cover them by having the attendees discuss them. This technique worked well all they way through the Workshop.

The interchange of ideas within the working groups, more so than career counseling by one man talking to another, proved very educational, inspirational, and emotionally effective by many Workshop participants. One participant made this typical comment: "The most valuable asset of the program seems to be the individual group discussions because each individual is directly participating and required to participate. This is very effective in drawing knowledge from the experience of others." Still another said, "The exchange of ideas is just great."

First Session

It was important to get the message across that job seeking was full-time work. One graduate of the Workshop, in a letter to the AIAA, underscored this point: "I worked harder and longer during the two months (unemployed) than at any other time in my life."

Another important lesson was that job seeking is basically a "selling" proposition, not engineering. This concept went down hard with many, most of whom never realized just how much selling they had actually done in their professional and personal lives.

Other typical comments on the first session illustrating basic points taught include the following:

-- "I have never been told how to see my capabilities or how to go about selling them. Because of this, I think these sessions will help tremendously."

-- "It made me more aggressive in selling myself and gave me confidence in a new approach in looking for a job."

At the end of the first session, many people felt themselves on a new track, that something different had been shown them, and this helped to instill confidence. Instead of hearing the same old thing over again, there were new techniques that were being explained. Most seemed to feel that there was logic in what they were learning and that it offered a good opportunity of success. Again some typical comments are revealing:

-- "Techniques and sequence of events with a better chance of achieving an interview are a radical departure from my historical practices. Therefore, if the new techniques are successful, this session alone is worth the time and effort."

-- "The first session seems valuable to bring one down to Earth on financial planning and preparing the product for market."

--'The session was helpful in getting bigger perspective of the situation from other participants. Comments and other ideas were helpful in taking new approach."

At the end of the first session an assignment is given, and the general outlines of letter and resume writing are explained. The attendees are asked to bring in copies of a new letter and a new resume for review by the others of the group.

Second Session

This review by disinterested, but conscientious colleagues, exerts great influence on the attendees. The review is impersonal and unprejudiced. There's no effort to spare feelings, just as there's no effort to hurt feelings for no cause. So the critiques come across as frank and constructive and with the weight of a peer's opinion. Some typical reactions to this process include these:

-- "Critique of resume extremely valuable because it gives positive feedback on the effectiveness of the presentation."

-- "The discussion and interchange of ideas and criticism was the most valuable part of this session."

-- "Excellent criticism."

Since a letter usually makes the first contact with most employers, its importance must be stressed, and for this reason most attendees rated the second session highly:

-- "The criticism of individual efforts drives home the lesson."

-- "This is an important session. The fact that other people can constructively criticize a personal resume can only be a help to all concerned."

-- "The process of critiquing the resume enables each individual to understand his good points, weaknesses and how to effect substantial improvement."

-- It provides the advantage of candid views without malice."

During the second session, attendees not only learned techniques, but also typically began to see that a lot more was involved in the job search than they had previously thought. Indeed, those who came to the second session usually acknowledged the value of going through the whole course, and most returned for the final interview session.

Often the counselors sent the attendees away with a very critical review of their material and asked them to bring it back to the third session for further review. Many did, and if it was still felt that the product could be improved, often counselors remained available to the attendees for long periods after the Workshop was actually over. Many attendees credited this extra attention with making the difference between success and failure in finding work.

Third Session

The third session covered preparation for and conduct of the interview. The attendees also learned about salary negotiations and how to cope with various kinds of interviews. Problem questions and matters of attitude were discussed at length.

But the major effort of the third session was a role-playing exercise in which each man set the stage for an interview he was going to have or would like to have. He was then interviewed by the counselor or another attendee. The session not only polished techniques, but also served to give the attendees an insight as to what the employer was looking for and what his problems were. As with the second session, on written materials, each interview was critiqued by the rest of the group. Typical attendee comments:

-- "Excellent program. The practice interview is the best training available."

-- "It gave me a preview of what I will face in an actual interview situation and should better prepare me for it."

-- "The job interview was extremely helpful. It points up that preparation for the interview is very important. "

In the third session the attendee learned that there was more to an interview than just showing up. The detailed investigation of the interviewer and his company that was necessary to have a good interview was underlined.

One of the most interesting things about the interview session was the unconscious and really bad mistakes that so many of the attendees made. It was evident to them that if they made them here at the Workshop, they also made them on actual interviews.

One of the Workshops tried an interesting experiment. It invited representatives of the local telephone company to come and discuss phone techniques with the attendees. This showed most of the unemployed woefully inadequate on the phone. It was suggested to the other Workshops that they try the same thing. It was eventually found, however, that this would mean a fourth session, with equipment obtained on loan from the telephone company. The idea still has merit and should be considered for Workshop activity.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

In the contract surveys taken at the conclusion of the Workshops, 91% thought that the whole Workshop had been very valuable; 96% praised the second session; 93% the third. Ninety-eight percent said they would recommend the Workshop to others.

Yet, six months later, it appeared that only 18% said the Workshops had been helpful in getting work and another 37% thought perhaps they had been some help. Why would somebody say that the Workshop had been of little or no help but recommend it to others?

We think such individuals absorb the Workshop training and before long assume they had it all along. The Workshop training exactly stresses initiative on the part of the job seeker--that if you don't do the work yourself, nobody is going to do it for you. When a man didn't credit his Workshop experience, we feel he nonetheless reflected its best influence--cultivating self-confidence in the job seeker.

Moreover, the information supplied attendees at the Workshop was not unique. It was a collection of what we believed to be the best information available and, as such, may already have been known to some of the attendees, who might have then tended to disregard it. For some, the Workshop information was simple to understand and absorb, and so must have seemed obvious once pointed out.

Then, too, it's difficult for a person to point to any one thing that helped him get a job. After all, he got the job, so he was the agent. For some attendees, the Workshop may simply have said all was not lost and it was possible to get a job. A person affected this way might well relegate the Workshop to a shading of his job-seeking experience. Certain other people were in such an emotional state that they did not absorb much information. Yet they left the Workshop in a lesser state of shock, feeling that they were not so badly off; they, too might tend not to credit the Workshop later on.

Finally, most people in the program felt that the payoff was in helping people, not in receiving credit. For this reason, those involved in a Workshop felt that good things were happening, even though they might not show up in a statistical analysis, and for that reason their enthusiasm stayed high. It would be hard to account for the number of hours that many persons put in if they had not felt that much that was worthwhile came out of it.

One counselor said, after he had done a number of Workshops, that he felt his attendees "displayed greater confidence, and an understanding of the systems

approach to job search, recognized the need for a major full-time campaign, direct mail, interviews, contacts with friends, associates, peers, neighbors, etc. , recognized that they were not alone and it was not a disgrace to be laid off because of lack of work, and realized possibly for the first time that they may not be able to work in their specialty for some time and they should consider alternatives."

Many attendees said much the same thing right after a Workshop:

-- "I've been unemployed for one year, and these Workshop sessions have graphically pointed out all of the things I've been doing wrong over and over again."

-- "The over-all approach is positive, creating a positive outlook. This is very important. The help in resume, approach letter and interviews is extremely valuable, something that could not be obtained elsewhere."

-- "Provided me with ideas I have never considered before and I'm sure would help me find a job."

-- "The criticism of individual efforts drives home the lesson."

-- "I know of no other way to become knowledgeable of the job-seeking process, and I was very ignorant."

-- "The Workshop has enabled me to approach job searching with confidence and a game plan."

-- "Your efforts and the efforts of the other members of your team are greatly appreciated. These efforts have changed me from 'one who knows not and knows not that he knows not' to 'one who knows and knows that he knows.' This has done wonders for my morale. Now when looking for a job, I know that my chances of success are greater because I am using the proper techniques and not depending on blind luck unknowingly."

In brief, those actually involved in a Workshop believed it made a significant impact.

In the non contract surveys taken at most of the AIAA Workshops, attendees were asked to rate each session on a scale of zero to ten, and the entire Workshop on the same scale. One large sample collected rated Session I at 7.2, with 51% rating it 8 or better. The rating for Session II was 8.2, with 76% rating it 8 or better. The rating for Session III was 7.7, with 66% rating it 8 or better. The over-all rating was 8.2, which was consistent with thousands of replies to the same survey: 73% rated it 8 or better and 94% said the Workshop would help their efforts. More than 99% said they would recommend it to others. These surveys remained remarkably consistent for nearly two years.

On another tack, a Workshop not only helped motivate the unemployed man to look in a new field, which he had to do, but also brought him in contact with employers from other fields and even other cities who were serving as counselors. By constant exposure to unemployed aerospace people, such counselors began to understand them better and be more amenable to hiring them. Many released aerospace engineers and scientists assumed they had little chance among non-aerospace employers. The Workshops spent a lot of time in trying to show the unemployed how to overcome a possibly prejudiced attitude of the prospective employer and even to turn supposed "flaws" of their experience to their advantage. However, it required that the unemployed man engage in what some felt were subterfuges, and many of these technical people resisted telling the truth"slant," in a favorable light. It was a help to such a person to have a non-aerospace employer tell him to select the view of his experience that best represented him to the prospective employer's interests, and to assert he could make himself attractive in this way to non-aerospace employers.

In selling the program to new cities and companies and in telling others about it, the question always came down to this ultimately: "But what success have you had? How many people who go through the Workshops ultimately get work--appropriate work that they like?"

Appendix A gives a detailed account of Workshop results. We regard these as good but not startling. We look more to the effect on attendees in the Workshop program. That has been favorable and pronounced. We look to letters like the two given in Appendix B. And to testimonials like these, of which we received many the like:

-- "While I cannot attribute my present job entirely to the Workshop, I am certain it provided a major assist at a crucial time."

-- "All the techniques that I learned from the Workshops really worked for me."

-- "I am so happy to tell you that I got the job at the GE Vallecitos Nuclear Center. I and my family are thanking you for your kind assistance and help during those moments of job hunting."

-- "I received three job offers in a period of four weeks using your methods."

-- "The training I received contributed decisively to my finding a new position quickly. I believe that the techniques presented not only got me the position but also resulted in an excellent salary offer."

-- "I would not have this present job if it had not been for the techniques I learned in the Workshop ... it would have not been possible without the ideas I learned from the Workshop ..."

WORKSHOP VARIATIONS

Several innovations grew out of the Los Angeles Workshops. After about a year, Los Angeles began to hold "reunion" sessions, calling back people from early Workshops to see what their experiences had been. Approximately 65% of those in attendance at the first L.A. Workshop had then gone back to work; but, discouragingly 35% were still unemployed. Of those who returned to work, all attributed their success in gaining employment in some part to the Workshop training.

The L.A. Section of AIAA also started a three-part seminar for the regular Workshop attendees' wives. It ran in conjunction with the Workshops, though not on the same night. These seminars reflected an unpleasant fact: Wives are part of the problem of the unemployed professional. One counselor, in the first session of each Workshop, asked each new attendee what the biggest problem was in his unemployment. One evening, four of the first five he asked replied, "my wife."

The first session of the seminar for wives dealt with the realities of the situation of the unemployed engineer and his family and discussed how wives could help each other with the problems encountered. The second session treated the emotional impact of the situation on all family members. The third part developed the positive actions a wife could take to help her husband re-establish himself professionally. This was the most ambitious of the several attempts to involve the wives. Other Workshops tried one -session seminars merely to expose wives to the problems and challenges confronting their husbands and in finding employment.

Unfortuately, it turned out that the wives who came to these seminars were the wrong ones. They quickly revealed themselves as looking for <u>other</u> ways to help their husbands, and had figured out most of his problems already. Several of the Workshops are still working on this problem, hoping to find a way of attracting the wives who really need a better understanding of their husbands' unemployment problems.

A San Francisco Workshop tried a "fourth session" for covering problems raised during the regular three Workshop sessions and not satisfactorily answered there. The chairman made note of questions and in the following week, lined up experts from the local area to sit on a panel and discuss these. These "fourth" sessions were very well attended. The panelists included librarians, people from employment services, representatives of groups formed to help people with financial problems, and the like.

The Cleveland Workshop devised a special "tutoring" workshop designed to help regular Workshop attendees who couldn't seem to grasp the material and chart themselves a course of action. It took on 16 men. They received intensive individual teaching (as compared to the group work of the regular Workshops) on using employment information, researching companies and fields, preparing written material, and conducting an interview. The counselors used expensive video-tape equipment in teaching interview techniques. AIAA funded this effort. It propelled 12 of the 16 into jobs within two months. Time and cost kept it from being used elsewhere. But it showed in high relief the effectiveness of the Workshop approach when charged with sufficient energy.

The AIAA staff developed a Workshop program for students built generally along the same lines as the Employment Workshops for professionals. Student workshops stress what the young man going out looking for his first job must do. The program has worked well and has been conducted vigorously by several AIAA Sections, notably Vandenberg and Los Angeles. The program has also been offered by AIAA to several hundred universities having engineering departments, and it's hoped that this program will become a permanent part of AIAA's operations.

Lastly, many other activities have grown out of the initial Workshop experience. Some ES offices now offer Workshops regularly on their premises. Several companies have given Workshops on their own premises to employees about to be laid off. And, after certain Workshops stopped formal organized sessions, the counselors kept on with successful in-house programs in their own firms. There have also been a number of commercial versions.

AIAA ASSESSMENT

Appendix A has already been cited as summarizing key findings of the contract follow-up survey.

To AIAA, the attendance, the increase in the number of participating cities, and the reception of employers, attendees and counselors all demonstrated the need for the Employment Workshop program, and to an extent, its effectiveness.

A consensus of AIAA opinion, particularly reflecting those who participated in the program in an administrative or counselor capacity, had the Workshop program bringing these benefits:

--Improving the morale of most attendees distinctly.

--Giving attendees who did not understand the true aerospace unemployment picture a more realistic idea of it and so a better understanding of what faced them.

--Teaching the concept of selling and thinking in terms of the employer's needs.

--Through counselors (often employers), driving home in specifics the importance of a systematic full-time job campaign.

--Teaching attendees how to find employment information, including prospective employers, and how to find "hiring influences."

--Pointing out the negative philosophy in employment screening "deselection."

--Making attendees actually use techniques for writing personal sales material, actually conduct interviews, and experience salary negotiation.

An interesting and pertinent unsolicited view was offered by an AIAA member who participated in 12 Workshops as a counselor. His remarks are attached as Appendix C.

Not all attendees learned or accepted the Workshop lessons. But most attendees found the Workshops instructive. And more than this, the fact that someone wanted to and tried to help at all improved the attitude of virtually all attendees. AIAA staff members who worked on the program steadily for nearly two years cannot remember any participant who did not feel that the program had been worthwhile.

In short, we think statistics, reports, and testimonials cannot convey the overriding value of the Workshop in making concrete the concern of their peers, the AIAA, and the Federal government, through DOL, for unemployed technical people.

APPENDIX A

Abstract of Highlights from Volume II, an Analytic Report on Some Effects of Twenty-two Workshops

1. Summary of Key Data Obtained at the Workshops

At the end of each session (three per Workshop) attendees were asked how valuable they thought it had been. Eighty-one percent attending the first session thought them "very" or "quite valuable." At the second and third sessions, the equivalent figures were 96% and 93%. For the Workshops as a whole, at the end of the third session, the sum of "very" or "quite valuable" responses was 91%.

At the first sessions, the total number who attended was 1,805, at the second 1,444 and at the third it was 1,190; 1,134 attended all three sessions.

It will be noted that between the first and second and the second and third sessions, there was an appreciable drop-off. The reasons for this are not fully understood, although there has been at attempt to find out by direct questioning of some drop-outs. Answers tend to be on the "couldn't make it," "car broke down" type, which cannot really explain so large a drop-out rate.

2. Summary of Key Data Obtained at the Two-Month Follow-up

(Based on 605 mail questionnaires returned by those who had attended all three Workshop sessions, i.e., 53% response; and for the comparison group, 220 questionnaires out of 478 individuals who did not eventually attend any sessions, i.e., 46% response.)

Two months after attendance at all three sessions of a Workshop, 22% of those who were unemployed at the time of the Workshop or who became unemployed thereafter (and who responded to the mail questionnaire) had found a new, permanent job (103 out of 459 invididuals.) Sixty-six percent of these job-finders had found their new employment outside aerospace.

The comparable figures among the comparison group were: 27% of those unemployed at the time of the Workshops, or subsequently, had found new permanent employment within two months (38 out of 143), 81% outside aerospace.

Thirty-nine percent of the Workshop attendees who found new employment said they were using aerospace experience in the new job to a "considerable extent," 57% said they were using their professional skills to a "considerable extent." Corresponding comparison group figures were: 24% and 62%.

The comparison group was not large in number compared with the test group. Comparison of the two groups has to be made with caution; in those attributes which were measured - age, education, academic and professional fields, and former employment, the differences are minor. Yet it cannot be said with confidence that the only difference between the two groups is their attendance or non-attendance at the Workshops.

A conservative interpretation would be that there is no evidence that the Workshops studied had a positive effect on the chances of securing a new, permanent job, nor that they particularly diverted those who attended away from aerospace, which was one of the goals of the program. (The observed difference between Workshop attendees and the comparison sample, with respect to utilization of aerospace experience can largely be attributed to the comparison group's finding new employment outside aerospace more frequently than the Workshop attendees. As noted, there is no significant difference in utilization of professional skills.)

Median annual income of those who had found new jobs within two months of attending the Workshops fell slightly from the level of their previous employment from just below $15,000 to $14,000.

Put in other terms, 47% experienced no change, 38% suffered a decrease and 15% actually gained in income.

Differences in the number of companies claimed to have been contacted, in the aerospace and non-aerospace industries, between Workshop attendees and the comparison group were not substantial, although some (statistically non-significant) tendency can be observed for those who attended to be more prone to contact non-aerospace companies than those in the comparison group. (34% of the Workshops' attendees who were unemployed at the time of the Workshop, or shortly thereafter, became unemployed, claimed to have contacted more than 50 non-aerospace companies by the time of the two-month follow-up, compared with 25% of the comparison group.)

One notable difference between the behavior of those who attended the Workshop and the comparison group was in the number of different resumes prepared. Of those who attended the Workshop and were, or shortly afterwards, became unemployed, 91% had prepared more than one resume two months after the Workshops ended, compared with 73% among the equivalent members of the comparison group. (Prior to the Workshops, incidentally, only 53% of those who attended had prepared more than one.) The lesson of packaging oneself for different markets does seem to have been learned.

Two months after the Workshops, 33% of those who were unemployed at the time of the Workshops, or who shortly afterwards became unemployed, had contacted the State Employment Service. Twenty-six percent found the Service helpful. There are no significant differences in securing new employment between those who did and those who did not contact the Service. (At the time of the Workshops, 69% had contacted their State Employment Service; again only 26% thought it was helpful.)

3. Summary of Key Data Obtained at the Six Month Follow-up
(Based on 251 returned mail-questionnaires, out of 356 who were contacted, 71% response. The 356 reported themselves unemployed at the time of the two-month follow-up.)

After six months, 25% of those who responded to the six-month follow-up questionnaire said they now had obtained permanent employment. Assuming that those who responded to the two mail questionnaires (the two and six-month follow-ups) were representative of those who attended the Workshops, it can be estimated that 42% of those who were unemployed at the time of the Workshops or who became unemployed within two months, had obtained new permanent employment within six months.

Those who, having participated in the Workshops, found employment within two months were considerably younger than those who found employment in the succeeding four months who, in turn, were younger than those who were still unemployed after six months.

4. Opinions about the Workshops' Value in Finding New Jobs

Of the 103 individuals who responded to the two-month follow-up questionnaire and who had found new and permanent employment, within two months of the Workshops they attended, 18% said they were helpful to them, and a further 37% said they were "perhaps" of some help in securing the job. Almost identical percentage responses were obtained from those 63 individuals who had found a job in between the two and six month follow-ups.

Of those who reported that they were unemployed at the time of the Workshops or who became unemployed shortly afterwards, all but 2% said they would recommend the Workshops to others. This suggests that participants believed the experience worthwhile months after the Workshops, just as they did at the time, even though they were not, on the whole, willing to ascribe much help in obtaining work.

The greatest help was perceived as being received in the areas of improving letters and resumes, and interviewing skills, i.e., in techniques needed to secure employment.

APPENDIX B

THIS IS A LETTER FROM AN ATTENDEE AT THE FIRST AIAA WORKSHOP. HIS JOB HUNTING EXPERIENCE MAY PROVIDE SOME VALUABLE LESSONS FOR YOU.

Dear Norm:

This letter has been on my mind for a long time. When I found my new job I was so thrilled that I devoted time to acquaint myself with the business of my new employer. However, I was not too busy to set aside one night per week to counsel at the Workshop. I wanted to pass on to others what I had learned.

When I attended the very first session at the Airport Marina, I was lucky in two ways - I was employed and I phoned for a reservation. At least several hundred were turned away probably because the newspaper article made no mention of reservations.

Before the first session was over, my confidence in myself had increased and I had plenty of homework for the next session. I appreciated the approach that only I could help myself - the Workshop could provide encouragement and techniques.

At the second session I thought I had the best resume. Well, I found out differently. The criticisms were severe but appropriate. By this time I was unemployed after 11 years with North American Rockwell and highly motiviated to write a good letter and resume.

I did not panic but concentrated on my approach. The third session was the one dear to my heart. The real test came when I had to conduct an interview. Even though it was role playing it was real and extremely rewarding to me.

Now you are wondering what happened after the Workshop. I wrote more than 50 letters to selected individuals within companies that appealed to me. I contacted 18 employment agencies by sending a note and resume. In addition, I called many of my friends (more than 30) and asked for leads and suggestions. I might mention that just these exercises put me in a better frame of mind.

I received 32 replies but only two opportunities for interviews.

My real lead came from a friend in an employment agency. I took his advice and drove to the company to talk to the chief engineer. He would not even come to the lobby. I was really discouraged.

My friend at the agency said he would call the company back and for me to think about how I could help the company. He arranged for an interview with the Marketing Director. The interview went well. I showed him several of my exhibits.

One week later we met again. After showing him more exhibits, he made me an offer. Two days later I dropped in to discuss the salary offer and how I could help him. Before I could start he informed me that he had to withdraw the offer. Recovering quickly, I said I was very interested and believed that I could offer his company a valuable asset.

Two days later I attended the Annual Meeting at which I met with the head of the division. The following day I showed up at the plant with a marketing plan and told the Marketing Director that I wanted the job and that I was the person to solve his problems. He was somewhat surprised at my enthusiasm and insistence. This time I talked to the chief engineer in person. Once we talked about jogging and he saw one of my exhibits - his reservations disappeared.

I was promised a yes or no answer that evening. It was Sunday morning before I got a reply - come to work in one week at a salary across the board. I thanked him for selling me to management . He replied that I sold myself.

Reflecting on how I got this job - I see I used the approach taught by the Workshop - preparation, persistence and perspiration. I believe Gary Grant once said that luck is when preparation meets opportunity.

One of the most rewarding experiences has been the opportunity to serve as a counselor at the Workshop. Again I wish to thank you, AIAA, and others who have made this project an overwhelming success.

As for the Workshop, I feel great that an organization like AIAA could respond to this human need in a critical time without regard to membership, company affiliation, level of education, sex, race, employment status, etc.

I have been tempted many times to blame the President, government, and the aerospace for my unemployment. The Workshop helped to put those thoughts in perspective and lend light to the darkness. Aerospace skills are valuable and with some personal effort can be applied to other industries.

After being unemployed for just two months, I now realize how a person's selfworth is related so closely to his ability to work - to earn.

Again thanks for the Workshop.

LETTER FROM AIAA WORKSHOP ATTENDEE

March 10, 1971

Dear Wayne:

I'm writing this letter to express my appreciation to you and your fellow AIAA Workshop counselors for the tremendous service you are rendering to the temporarily unemployed members of the professional community. I would like to describe my personal job hunting experiences in some detail, in the event that this information might be of benefit to people who will attend Workshop sessions in the future.

I attended the first Workshop session while I was still employed, with no real expectation that I would be layed off in the near future. I had only mild concern about a lay-off because I knew that my department had adequate budget to support the present level of personnel. On Friday of that week, I was layed off; the company had arbitrarily decided to operate on an understaffed basis and they selected the two highest paid and oldest people in the department for lay-off.

I was pretty well shocked and demoralized. In twenty years in industry I had never spent a day out of work, and all my previous job changes (three) had been the result of my finding better positions while still employed. I remained in a state of depression until the second Workshop session, which served to greatly boost my morale. After some retrospect on what I had heard at the first two sessions, I realized two key things. These key things were to result in my obtaining three job offers within eight weeks of the time I was layed off. Key item number one was the discovery that <u>there were still good jobs available</u> - many of them, in fact. (Of course, I also realized that the competition for these jobs was severe.) Key item number two was the realization that nobody was going to get one of these jobs for me except myself. Many people, of course, provided extremely valuable advice and assistance, but the main driving force had to come from me. With these thoughts in mind to motivate me, I resolved to wage the most vigorous job finding campaign of which I was capable; the sooner I found a job, the less I would deplete my savings. I found that there were so many things that I could do to help myself, that I was kept busy over twelve hours a day, seven days a week.

During the first few days after I was layed off, and during the period I was still depressed, I looked at many alternate ways of making a living including such things as distributorships, franchises, stock brokering, commission salesman, etc. I finally concluded that my best chances would be to stick with what I knew the most about and what I could do best, namely engineering. I also made a firm commitment to get out of aerospace for good.

The first step in my job hunting campaign was then undertaken in earnest. This consisted of the compilation of an accomplishment data bank. This data bank took over two weeks to prepare and refine. I went back over my twenty years of experience and reduced to writing every significant accomplishment of my career. This included individual accomplishments as well as those that were performed as a member of a group. To my amazement, this list was over thirty pages long in rough draft form. The next step was to boil each accomplishment statement down to the most succinct and well-written form possible. To the greatest extent possible, these statements explicitly illustrated how the accomplishment had benefited the company (profit increased X dollars, costs decreased Y dollars, efficiency increased Z percent, etc.)

Now that I had a fairly good idea of what the product consisted of, I was ready to merchandise it. Like most merchandising campaigns, the first step was to advertise. I contacted every person I could remember being associated with during my professional career, every social acquaintance, and every business acquaintance. (Doctor, attorney, tax accountnat, etc.) In making these contacts I did not stress my need for a job, rather I told them that I was between jobs, available and, if they heard of any opportunities which matched my desired criteria for a new position, I would appreciate them letting me know about it.

I also began to selectively answer newspaper advertisements and to contact companies which I thought might provide interesting opportunities. In replying to newspaper ads (which were mostly blind ads), I used only brief, highly sales oriented letters. In contacting companies, I did sufficient research to determine the specific individual in the company who would be in a position to hire me and wrote him a brief sales-minded letter. All letters that I wrote drew on information from my data bank and were specifically tailored to most favorably reflect my capabilities to the job requirements.

During this advertising period of about two weeks duration, I contacted over three hundred people by phone (nationwide), wrote about thirty letters in response to ads, and contacted five companies directly. The end result of this effort was gratifying. I received a number of replies requesting that I submit a resume.

Only now was I really in a position to write a resume that I felt had a good chance of winning a job. I wrote ten resumes in all and each was written in response to a request. Each resume was a completely original document aimed 100% at the requirements of the given job. I tried to attain perfection in each resume submitted and this usually required five or more rewrites of each one. In writing the resumes a major research effort was undertaken to gain an understanding of the exact position requirements. Using the data, it was then possible to tailor the resume to these specific requirements. I felt that it was important to eliminate all extraneous accomplishment information from the resume that did not pertain to the job it was aimed at. I payed a great deal of attention to format and made much use of underlining headings and indenting to provide ease of reading and clarity.

The ten resumes I submitted resulted in three interview situations. By interview situations, I refer to the fact that my interviews with each company were in fact multiple interviews. I had between three and ten interviews respectively with the three different companies. One of the interview situations was the result of an answer to a blind ad, one to a direct contact with a company, and one through a lead I got through one of my personal contacts.

Getting ready for the interviews was the most important and the most time consuming aspect of my job hunting campaign. I first set out to learn as much about the company as was possible. I found that this was relatively easy to do. In each case I had long telephone conversations with the public relations manager of the involved company. I never needed to tell them why I wanted the information. These people were pround enough of what their companies were doing that my expressed interest in them was sufficient to have them volunteer all the information they had. One conversation lasted over two hours. I also got information from my stock broker, from any contacts that I could develop inside the company and from any other available source. I then followed the Workshop interview preparation suggestions to the letter. I believe that this element of my campaign was the most important reason for my success. I was so well prepared for each interview that I was able to maintain complete poise and self-confidence. So much so, in fact, that the interviewers were probably more ill at ease than I. This, in turn, allowed me to direct the course of the interview the way I wanted it to go.

After each interview I scrupulously followed the suggestion of writing an interview follow-up letter. I also made many follow-up phone calls to each company. I wrote sixteen follow-up letters and made some twenty-five phone calls. This follow-up activity took place over a period of about two weeks. During this period I did not slack up on my advertising campaign but continued to re-contact previous acquaintances, answer blind ads, etc.

Then, on Friday morning, seven weeks after I was layed off, the first break came. The president's secretary from the company that I had been interviewed by ten people (over a three day period) called and said that the president would be calling me later on during the day. I waited all day but no call came. In order to keep my morale up during the weekend, I worked harder than every on some new opportunities that were beginning to look promising.

Early Monday morning, I got a call from the second company to come to lunch with the division general manager. (I had still not heard from the president of the first company.) During lunch I was offered a job at a 10% salary cut. I was happy to have the offer and probably would have accepted on the spot if the call from the president of the first company (which I preferred) hadn't been pending. Very fortunately, I requested the opportunity to think the job offer over for a day or two.

When I got home from lunch, I was called by the president of the first company. Could I come to work immediately? The salary offer and fringe benefits amounted to about a 55% increase over what I had been making in my previous job. I was astounded and naturally accepted the offer at once. Later that week, I got a telegram offer from the third company at an across-the board salary. Needless to say I declined the offer.

As it has turned out getting layed off was the biggest break in my career. In thinking back on what elements of my campaign were most responsible for successfully achieving my objective I can name five primary factors:

1. The guidance I received from the AIAA Workshops Sessions. I did my best to follow their recommended groundrules to the letter.

2. The personal assistance I got from the AIAA Workshop counselors. I even called several at home when I was in the need of advice and guidance.

3. The approach in all my communications (both oral and written) with potential employers was to be concerned only with what I could do for them and not with what they could do for me. I never discussed items such as fringe benefits, working hours, holidays, vacations, etc.

4. Good morale and self-confidence generated by the data bank preparation task. Complete self-confidence is of utmost importance in maintaining good poise during an interview.

5. And, most importantly, hard work. I worked harder and longer during the two months than at any other time in my life.

I again want to thank you and the other Workshop counselors for invaluable assistance.

My best personal regards,

Lee

P.S. Please feel free to publish this letter and edit it in any way you wish if you think it would be of value in future Workshop sessions.

APPENDIX C

Note: This is an excerpt from a paper prepared by an AIAA member who served as a counselor in thirteen Workshops in Philadelphia. The member, Thomas G. Greene, is also chairman of the local Section. His unexpected paper arrived just as this report was being finished and its inclusion seemed appropriate as an unsolicited non-staff observation of and reaction to the Workshops. (The same day, we heard that the man who had led all thirteen Workshops there and also counseled and truly been personally responsible for the great success of the Philadelphia Workshops, had himself just been laid off.)

.....How, you say, can scientists and engineers, trained for years to be objective, analytical and ultraprecise in their thinking, become subjective, emotional or psychologically incapable of clear communication? Let us examine what job loss means to a professional man.

For some highly trained persons the loss of a job is a "castrating experience," creating feelings of impotence and helplessness. For others it creates a real "identity crisis," because identity for many derives from the nature of the jobs they hold. Thus, for some, job loss is "image shattering," creating a "failure complex" of guilt and worthlessness. Still others may regress to childlike dependency, apathetic withdrawal, and effacement. The emotional shock waves that spread from these reactions create further problems and concerns in each man's relationship with others, especially with members of his family. Lest one think the picture here painted is exaggerated, these reactions to one degree or another, are quite commonplace. And cases of suicide among older engineers and executives and, sometimes, their wives are documented.

For a small few, the loss of their jobs provides a welcome relief, a liberation from occupational boredom and an opportunity, indeed a goad for a career change. They are compelled to knock on new doors, to gamble on new paths and new opportunities. For these, a complete job change can relieve heavy job pressures, self disillusionment and even perhaps, add ten years to their life expectancy. These, however, are not the ones we are concerned with today, other than to provide clues for the guidance of the others.

For the most part, the engineers most severly affected by unemployment are the older men. Certainly, they are less resilient and, like an old dog who can't be taught new tricks, they are set in their habits. Psychologists tell me that the term "set" is a valid description of a complex of ingrained habit patterns which man is reluctant to change. Several of the definitions in the dictionary are appropriate. These include obstinate, rigid, immovable, to put in a fixed state, to make unyielding or obstinate, as one's mind.

These sets then work against understanding, particularly when confronted by the shock of layoff.

There has been a distinct change in job market and for many older professionals, the recognition and acceptance of this change is difficult to achieve. Remember, most of the men affected in the aerospace and electronics industry have fifteen or more years service in the industry. These are the ones most affected and most set in their habit patterns. Oddly, those with two kinds of work history have almost the same reaction. The aerospace nomads, for whom job changes were easy when a contract ran out in the past, are just as shocked as the long term career employees who are faced with job search after many years with one firm. The fact that jobs must be sought aggressively against keen competition and against disheartening rejections makes acceptance of the situation hard for both kinds.

These older professionals have developed attitudes toward their company and toward the economy and the industry which are suddenly refuted by the shock of layoff. Still another factor against adaptation to the change is the economic shock. The advent of the industrial revolution materially changed society's attitude toward frugality and borrowing. Today's economy requires of a man a certain bonded indebtedness. The tradeoff between savings and living up to one's level of earnings may have tragic consequences when suddenly confronted by an extended period of unemployment. Another major factor is the problem of image mentioned earlier. This latter factor is one of the most difficult to overcome and is perhaps one of the greatest barriers to communication.

The evidence that communications barriers exist lies in the reactions of these engineers to dismissal. Remember, dismissal is usually direct, sudden and irrevocable. Certainly, in the opinion of the professional dismissed, the final notification is sudden and unexpected, even though he may have been anticipating it with his rational reasoning side. The act itself is often performed with guilt feelings by the person responsible and is experienced with anger and shock by the person dismissed. Sometimes both skill and regret are absent. Too many managers look upon the firing of an employee as an unpleasant duty to be done as quickly as possible. Is it any wonder that reactive barriers are set up by the human beings most directly affected. Let us examine some of these reactions.

The most immediate reaction to dismissal is disbelief and this is probably the most difficult problem to overcome. It doesn't just last for a day or so, it can stretch out for weeks or months. This includes the idea that it's all a bad dream. " Tomorrow, the boss will call me and tell me to come back to work." Some of the most extreme evidence of disbelief is refusal to tell the neighbors and others that one is laid off. A classic case has been described in which the engineer's wife didn't know he was unemployed for several months, since he dressed for work and left each morning on time and returned in time for dinner, briefcase in hand.

This disbelief also results many times in refusal to change job interests despite clear evidence that jobs no longer exist in the engineer's area of greatest experience.

Another reaction clearly obvious is resentment. This resentment can be against the company, the industry and the economy, against those still employed, against the economic systems and against professional societies for allowing the problem to develop.

Still another reaction can be termed "avoidance." One of the problems that counselors must overcome is the tendency to substitute less important objectives for the main objective - finding a new job. Some engineers delay their job seeking, doing work around the house such as painting and repairs rather than tackling job search as a full time task.

Another reaction akin to the refusal to recognize the changed job situation is confusion and temporary loss of rational thinking. Here the engineer forgets his reasoned, logical approach to the solution of problems.

The hazard here is that he can mail out a thousand duplicate copies of a poorly prepared, error-filled resume, to his own detriment. Such behavior is akin to panic and is evidenced in many a counselling session by the nature of questions asked. For example, "How can I get 17 years of experience onto one page?" How indeed, when the only job available may call for not more than eight years experience.

The final and perhaps the most severe reaction is despair. This can come after fruitless weeks of search or months of unemployment or under-employment. The ultimate in this, as mentioned earlier, is suicide. This despair shows through as bitterness. As examples, here are two responses to a questionnaire AIAA sent out, which arrived in the same mail. The question asked of those who found reemployment was, "In your opinion, who or what was mainly responsible for getting you this job?"

1. "My previous background experience of "board" work was responsible for my draftsman job at a 60% cut in salary and 25 years of aerodynamics experience, "shot to hell!"

2. The other response to the same question was as follows, "After deciding a "working" man's job might be an interim answer, I took a job as a $4.00 per hour mechanic. It was only a matter of time before I was given engineering responsibility. Since January lst, I have been the acting plant manager and I have been given two raises -- which may or may not prove anything except sometimes the way to responsibility is to start from the bottom! The Workshop evaluation of engineering opportunities in our area, however, was what convinced me to compete from the blue collar side (I am 54 years old and this didn't help much on direct engineering type jobs)".

What a difference in attitude! It almost becomes obvious that the results of

optimism as well as bitterness are self-fulfilling. Enough of the reactions and symptoms, how do you solve the problem of communications just described? There are several possible solutions, all based on understanding of the problem and even more, on understanding the psychic barriers, the human reactions of the individuals, and most important, taking advantage of the modus operandi and logical-thinking minds of the engineers involved. This cannot be done by preaching to them, by giving them books to read or sample resumes to copy. They must be led to the conclusions themselves, reasoning out the logic behind the idea of letters of application and functional resumes, which are new to them. Herein lies the success of the peer group AIAA type Workshop which has worked well for so many.

Compare the acceptance an engineer will give to the bold statement in one company's booklet on job hunting, "Don't underestimate the difficulty of the task, but avoid depression and discouragement," with his acceptance of experience related by a fellow engineer in a workshop type session. It's hearing it from someone you respect, be it counselor, or fellow engineers in a give and take discussion in which the gory experiences of others are debated actively. It's hearing of the mistakes and the successes of others that persuades you to avoid making those mistakes yourself.

These "self-help" Workshops have been relatively successful. I say relatively, because not everyone who has participated has found a job. But let's look at the record. After the first six months of our Workshops, we conducted a survey of the participants of these Workshops. The results indicated that 34% of those who lost their jobs found new employment within two months: one third of these in aerospace, two thirds in non-aerospace. This compares with a nation-wide result of 27% of Workshop attendees who found employment in the same period.

Perhaps the true essence of the Workshops are contained in the counselor's notes for the first session: "As a Counselor for this program, you will find that there are many conflicting opinions on the "proper" approach to a job search. There are many people, organizations, and books that claim to have the one and only answer to job seeking. Our experience has shown that there is no one way that is best for everybody. Each man must learn and assess the various methods and apply those, which in his opinion, best suit the circumstances. We believe that different situations call for variations in techniques, and the idea of trying to develop one universal method will dilute the overall effort. We are trying to offer a philosophy, and hope that each man adapts it to suit himself.

The Workshops also provide a sounding board to test ideas and approaches. Impersonal evaluations are offered by the other attendees who will tell what one's efforts look like to them. This is a type of service that is not readily obtained in any other fashion, and allows a man to polish his efforts.

A major objective is to try to see that each person leaves the Workshop with a knowledge of the various job-seeking techniques and with his own personal plan of action in addition to letters and a resume he believes will work for him."

We in AIAA believe the Workshop method just described offers the best solution to date in "communicating with the engineer who is unemployed."